

## **PART IV - SECTION M**

### ***EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD***

#### **M.1 EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

#### **M.2 SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS**

a. Offers must be submitted in accordance with Section L. Offerors must meet ALL SIR requirements, terms and conditions, representations and certifications, technical requirements, and identified factors and subfactors, to be eligible for award. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the SIR may result in the Offeror being removed from consideration for award.

b. Evaluation is defined as review and consideration of Offeror's written submissions determined to be competitive as determined by the Government as part of the source selection process.

c. Offers will be evaluated with respect to Technical/Business Management, Past Performance and Cost/Price.

d. Offers that fail to meet the minimum requirements of the statement of work and are unrealistic in terms of technical content, schedule commitments or cost/price, will be considered to lack technical competence or indicate a failure to comprehend the complexity of the contract requirements, and may be grounds for a determination that an Offer is no longer considered in line for award.

e. Offers that are unbalanced as to prices, may be rejected. An unbalanced offer is one, which is based on prices significantly less than prices for some work, and prices, that are significantly overstated for other work of a similar nature. Prices which are unrealistically low or unreasonably high may be indicative of the Offeror's lack of understanding of the work effort or the ability to perform the contract and may be cause for rejection of the Offer.

f. Offerors are cautioned not to minimize the importance of an adequate response in any area because of importance or visibility. Despite the stated order of importance, Cost/Price will become increasingly more important as difference in technical scores decreases.

g. The Offeror must be financially viable and otherwise responsible in accordance with the FAA Acquisition Management System (AMS). To be eligible for award, the Offeror must be technically and financially capable of performing the work.

h. If at any point during the evaluation process, the FAA concludes that the Offeror does not have a reasonable chance of receiving this award, the FAA may eliminate the Offeror

## **PART IV - SECTION M**

### ***EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD***

from further consideration for award. Any Offeror eliminated from further consideration will be officially notified in writing.

i. In evaluating the offers, the Government may conduct written or oral communications with any and/or all Offerors, and reserves the right to reduce the participants in the competition to only those Offerors most likely to receive award. The Government reserves the right to conduct communications and negotiations with any individual competing Offeror, or all competing Offerors, as the situation may warrant. Communications with one or more Offerors will not require the Government to conduct communications with all Offerors. If communications are necessary with one or more Offerors, the Government reserves the right to request revised offers.

j. The FAA reserves the right to award a contract immediately following the conclusion of the evaluation of the initial offers, without discussions or negotiations. Therefore, it is critical that each offer be fully responsive to this SIR/RFO and its provisions.

### **M.3 BASIS FOR AWARD**

#### **M.3.1 AWARD SELECTION**

This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with the FAA Acquisition Management System (AMS). Award will be made to the Offeror whose proposal is judged to represent the best value to the Government. Best value will be based on an evaluation of all factors in relation to the stated evaluation criteria and will be determined by evaluating each proposal in the areas shown in this section. Volume II, Price Proposal will be evaluated for reasonableness, completeness, realism and consistency/traceability with the technical and management approach. Inherent in the evaluation of the factors below will be a government assessment of risk. The Source Selection Official (SSO) will consider the final evaluation and use his/her best judgment to arrive at a Best Value decision. Therefore, the successful Offeror may not have submitted the lowest price. While the government evaluation team and the SSO will strive for maximum objectivity, the evaluation process, by nature, is subjective and professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process. The Government intends to select one contractor for the MALSR LED IR Contract. However, the Government reserves the right to make multiple awards or no award at all, depending on the quality of the proposals submitted and the availability of funds.

#### **M.3.2 DOWN SELECT DECISIONS**

## **PART IV - SECTION M**

### ***EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD***

The FAA reserves the right to make down select decisions prior to a final award decision. These decisions will be made after receipt and evaluation of responses to the requirements of this Screening Information Request (SIR). Each down select decision will be based upon identification of those Offerors deemed to be least likely to receive the award.

If at any point during the evaluation process, the FAA concludes that the Offeror does not have a reasonable chance of receiving this award, the FAA may eliminate the Offeror from further consideration for award. Any Offeror eliminated from further consideration will be officially notified in writing.

#### **M.3.3 EVALUATION ORDER OF IMPORTANCE**

The technical approach is greater in importance. Volume I is more important than Volume II. Within Volume I, Factor 1 is more important than Factors 2, 3, and 4. As the identified discriminators in Volume I become less significant, the importance of price increases.

#### **M.3.4 ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARD/DISCUSSIONS WITH OFFERORS**

The Offeror must be financially viable and otherwise responsible in accordance with the FAA AMS guidelines. To be eligible for award, the contractor team must be technically and financially capable of performing the magnitude and scope of the work.

In evaluating the proposals, the Government may conduct written or oral communications with any and/or all Offerors. Additionally, the FAA reserves the right to conduct discussions and negotiations with any individual competing Offeror, or all competing Offerors, as the situation warrants. Discussions with one or more Offerors do not require discussions with all Offerors.

#### **M.3.5 EVALUATION PROCESS**

##### **M.3.5.1 Evaluation**

The Technical Evaluation will be the determining factor for this contract award. The Cost Evaluation results will only be used as part of the contract award if the Technical Evaluation results are equivalent.. The Offeror's submittal will be evaluated based on the Offeror's proposed approach, understanding of the requirements and the proposed capability and experience to meet the FAA's requirements. Based on this assessment, an adjectival rating will be derived for each of the factors specified below. Each factor will be rated by assigning one of the adjectival ratings contained in paragraph M.3.6. An overall adjectival rating will be given. Judgment will be applied in the evaluation to derive the overall rating. Elements are not individually rated and are not listed in any order of importance.

## **PART IV - SECTION M**

### ***EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD***

The following criteria will be used to evaluate each proposal:

#### **Volume I – Technical Proposal**

#### **Section I – Technical Approach**

#### **Factor 1 – Systems Engineering Design and Development**

**Element 1.1 – Systems Engineering:** Demonstrate the specific System Engineering (SE) approaches or techniques for implementing each SE process and provides guidance for selecting the right approach or process to execute sections C.3.1 and C.3.2 of this SOW. Degree to which the proposal demonstrates the offeror's capabilities as they relate to the specific functional areas of the Statement of Work and the Capabilities outlined in Section L.

**Element 1.2 – Manufacturing:** Demonstrate the current and future capability of manufacturing LED lamps with or without an infrared source. This should discuss the facilities, equipment, and production capabilities such as who, what, when, where and how.

#### **Factor 2 – Program Management**

**Element 2.1 – Management Organization:** Degree to which the proposed organizational structure demonstrates a clear understanding of program requirements, priorities, and risks. Extent, to which proposed lines of communication and escalation procedures provide confidence that program status, issues, and risks will be effectively identified, communicated, addressed, and resolved. Degree to which the proposed organizational structure facilitates effective program execution.

**Element 2.2 – Program Management Approach:** Degree to which the proposed management processes, tools, and techniques provide confidence that the Offeror will effectively and efficiently plan, execute, monitor, and control its efforts and the efforts of all subcontractors to meet contractual requirements and assure quality in a timely and cost effective manner. Extent to which the proposed processes provide confidence that potential changes to the project baseline will be identified early and appropriate mechanisms will be utilized to correct variances and control changes. Degree to which the proposed WBS is complete and suitable for the MALSR LED Replacement Lamp program with respect to the Offeror's proposed approach.

## **PART IV - SECTION M**

### *EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD*

**Element 2.3 – Key Personnel:** The Offeror shall demonstrate the degree to which the qualifications (experience, education, and certifications) of proposed key personnel demonstrate the knowledge and experience needed to successfully fill prescribed key personnel roles. The Offeror shall demonstrate the extent to which skills and experience of their proposed key personnel aligns with the Officer’s proposed design and approach.

#### **FACTOR 3 – Past Performance**

**Element 3.1 – Past Performance:** The Offeror shall demonstrated their successful performance with other projects similar to the MALSR LED Replacement Lamp effort in size, scope and complexity. Successful past performance will be evaluated based on the Offeror’s written response as well as on input from individuals and organizations familiar with the work efforts, products and schedule and cost performance of each Offeror, as demonstrated through previous or ongoing contracts of a similar size, scope and complexity. The Government reserves the right to contact prior clients of the Offeror, subcontractors and consultants, including references other than those identified by the Offeror, and to use those results in this evaluation.

#### **Volume II – Price Proposal**

##### **Section I – Price Proposal**

The prices for CLINs 0001 through 1008 will be evaluated to determine if the Offeror submitted current data, supporting schedules, or substantiation that is sufficient to establish the completeness, consistency, reasonableness, and realism of the proposed price.

### **M.3.6 ADJECTIVAL RATINGS**

Proposals will be evaluated using adjectival ratings. The criteria in section L.17.1 will be rated as follows:

Rating	Description
Excellent	The offeror’s response to the topic is comprehensive and demonstrates a thorough understanding of the full range of requirements and work effort. Few, if any, areas for improvement can be cited. The combined impact of the strengths far outweighs the combined impact of the weaknesses.
Good	The offeror’s response to the topic is fully acceptable and appropriately responds to the full range of requirements and work

**PART IV - SECTION M**  
*EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD*

	effort. A few minor weaknesses are noted. The combined impact of the strengths outweighs the combined impact of the weaknesses.
Satisfactory	The offeror's response to the topic is appropriate and addresses adequately the full range of requirements and work effort. Although there may be some weaknesses and areas in need of improvement, these are offset by strengths in other areas.
Marginal	The offeror's response does not respond adequately to the full range of requirements and work efforts. Offeror's response is deficient in several areas with few corresponding offsets in other areas. The combined impact of the weaknesses outweighs the combined impact of the strengths.
Unsatisfactory	The offeror's response to the topic is inadequate and does not demonstrate a satisfactory understanding of the requirements and work efforts. The proposal does not demonstrate the capability to support the Government's needs. The combined impact of the weaknesses far outweighs the combined impact of the strengths.

End of Section M